

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO
Fresno, California 93740

Campus Planning Committee
Minutes
September 27, 2012

Members

Present: Deborah Adishian-Astone, Amy Armstrong, Robert Boyd, Charles Boyer, Rick Finden, Paul Halajian, Lisa Kao, John Kriebs, Toni Marchini, Dennis Nef, Patrick Newell, Jan Parten, Joseph Taviano, Cynthia Teniente-Matson, Richard Vaillancour, Bernard Vinovrski and Gary Wilson

Absent: Larry Piper (CO)

Guests: Jacinta Amaral, John Constable, Tom Gaffery and Lynn Williams

Meeting called to order at 3:33 p.m.

1. Approval of the September 27, 2012, agenda.

It was MSC to approve the September 27, 2012, agenda, followed by introductions.

2. Approval of the August 24, 2012, meeting minutes.

Second bullet under New Bike/Pedestrian Path from Chestnut to Woodrow Avenues should read: Added a crosswalk on the north *and south* side of the roundabout to accommodate those coming from Chardonnay Avenue. It was MSC to approve the minutes of August 24, 2012, as corrected.

3. Review Schematic Design - Jordan Research Center (*Action*) – Astone

Ms. Astone shared that at our last meeting Toby Hasselgren, an architect with Zimmer Gunsul Frasca (ZGF) Architects, presented the schematic design for the new Jordan Research Center. The facility will be located at the southeast corner of Barstow and Woodrow Avenues currently the site of the feed mill and hay/agronomy storage facilities. The Jordan Research Center will be approximately 30,000-square-foot and will contain spaces dedicated to the research activities of the Jordan College of Agricultural Sciences and Technology (JCAST), Lyles College of Engineering and the College of Science and Mathematics. The building program does not include instructional spaces such as lecture rooms or teaching laboratories.

There were no significant concerns with the design as presented at the last meeting; therefore, Ms. Astone returned with request for approval of the schematic design and exterior elevations in preparation for approval by the CSU Board of Trustees at their November 2012 meeting.

Work has begun with the JCAST to design and construct replacement hay storage facilities at the respective animal units. A small storage facility adjacent to the Graduate Laboratory building will replace the agronomy storage that is currently being utilized at this location.

Dr. Williams commented that a number of colleagues expressed concern over the name of the building. He noted that the facility is a gift to the college of agriculture and yet there is nothing on the name of the building that suggests the gift is dedicated for that college. Dean Boyer noted that the building is intended to facilitate research in agriculture, food and natural resources, among them water and air, resources that are important to this valley. He also noted that the donors are fine with the name that was chosen. Ms. Astone added that the gift was for both the naming of the college and this facility.

Dr. Amaral requested additional information in regards to the oversight for architect plans and program development that went into this building.

Chair Matson stated that the university has been working on this project for several years. There has been a number of site visits, specialized consultation (specifically in the area of research), and extensive program review with the various scientists that will be utilizing this facility as well as other college personnel.

Ms. Astone elaborated on the selection process for the project architect. In order to ensure that this building is designed with the latest state-of-the-art science-related design features, the university interviewed architectural firms that have designed similar type facilities because they provide a certain knowledge and expertise given the building's programmatic requirements.

In addition, ZGF (the architect selected), has a lab consultant on their design team. This consultant will assist with the coordination of lab equipment with the utility infrastructure, among other requirements and needs. This same project team has worked together on similar type research facilities at UC Berkley, Stanford and other higher education institutions.

Mr. Boyd further added that about three or four years ago, a facilities team and a couple of other individuals visited UC Davis for an extensive tour of their research facility. This team spoke with their program designers who then visited our campus and helped us start the preliminary layout for this project. There has been a lot of effort in ensuring that this project meets the needs of the campus and that it provides the flexibility and growth capacity that will serve our University for years to come.

Dean Boyer added that faculty researchers drove the needs and discussions during the programming sessions and have been very involved in this project.

Mr. Taviano asked if there would be any impact on traffic flow and parking for students and the date and length of construction.

Mr. Boyd responded that there would be no impact to parking. The temporary laydown area for construction can be accommodated around the project site. Any additional need for construction parking would be met by using the parking lot east of the Animal Science Pavilion and will not impact parking for students or faculty. This parking lot is used predominantly for special events. Construction is scheduled to commence in spring 2014 and will last about 18 months. Ms. Armstrong added that the roadway improvements will expand the path of travel along Barstow Avenue.

Chair Matson reiterated that this is the project's second review at this committee level and entertained a motion. Mr. Halajian moved to approve the schematic design for the Jordan Research Center as presented. Mr. Kriebs seconded.

Chair Matson clarified that the only outstanding item on this project is the Equestrian team's existing access along this path which would be addressed in the coming months. Hearing no other comments or concerns, the question was called. Motion carried without opposition or abstention.

4. CPC and Subcommittees Charge and Structure (*Action*) – Matson

Chair Matson provided a review of the discussion that started at the July 2012 Campus Planning Committee (CPC) meeting and briefly reviewed the five documents that were distributed at the August 24 CPC meeting. The documents provided the background of Campus Planning and a redline review of the four subcommittee (Arboretum, Campus Sustainability, Monumental Arts and

Traffic & Safety) charges. At those meetings, members discussed a number of concerns with the existing committee and subcommittee structures, including but not limited to:

- Difficulty in filling current vacancies/seats within Campus Planning and its subcommittees;
- Challenges in convening the group(s) due to impacted schedules of current members; and
- Changes in campus staffing where the position stated in the charter no longer exists or is vacant.

A review of the various concerns and suggestions made during the last meeting, and in an effort to be more inclusive so that we have the most amount of input moving forward, rendered the following three considerations for faculty representation on the CPC:

Option 1: The structure remains as is and we move forward with the modifications to the various subcommittee charters as proposed. A big concern with this option is that we need to secure a member of Facilities and Campus Environmental Liaison (FACEL) that can serve on this committee relatively quickly because we have not had a FACEL representative in the last year due to the lack of availability of a FACEL faculty member.

Option 2: In lieu of FACEL Chair designation, we could substitute two faculty members to be appointed and the remainder of the CPC structure remain as is.

Option 3: Streamline CPC subcommittees and broaden faculty representation on Campus Planning by adding a faculty representative from each school/college and the library and realigning the subcommittees. One idea is to look at combining a couple of the subcommittees and sunsetting the other two so that we go from four subcommittees to two.

Chair Matson highlighted that Campus Planning has a fairly broad representation but it is missing more input, potentially, from faculty representatives that are not currently appointed to the committee. Discussion commenced with considerable comments and concerns in regard to option 3.

Mr. Vaillancour expressed concern with eliminating the subcommittees in that this might cause CPC to become too burdened with the multiple issues and projects that come forward.

Chair Matson offered that Campus Planning already covers grounds, traffic and safety issues in all of the projects that come before this body. This would in fact eliminate the additional review currently required by those subcommittees which is, in essence, what is currently happening in practice.

The Monumental Arts Subcommittee will be sunsetted in the next few months. Mr. Boyd and Mr. Gaffery have been wrapping up some projects for that group. This group will become the Monumental Arts and Peace Garden Subcommittee which will subsume the monumental arts piece. This change was approved a year ago. This committee does not meet frequently, but it does cover projects that require additional or a more detailed review.

Campus Sustainability did not meet at all last year; however, they have done various activities. The university places considerable focus on sustainability when adding buildings and working on projects. However, the Campus Sustainability Subcommittee was also intended to look at sustainability throughout the university community. Some of that has lacked due to workload issues from all facets of the university. As it currently stands, the oversight for that work could be done at CPC. There is also the possibility that a task force could be established to look at sustainability issues more closely and as necessary.

Ms. Armstrong is a member of FACEL and shared a comment that was made by that group at its last meeting. It is believed that broader representation by faculty members at Campus Planning would facilitate their ability to go back and report to their respective colleges. Furthermore, some projects are only going to affect one college and not the others, thus this structure would be more likely to ensure that the information going out is reaching the right (interested) group. This arrangement would serve to strengthen the communication with academics.

Dr. Williams agreed with Ms. Armstrong's comment and added that the communication aspect is a very important part of this restructuring. Another item to take into consideration is that junior faculty need opportunities to be involved in service for retention, tenure and promotion purposes. If we start eliminating committees, we eliminate those opportunities.

Dr. Newell asked if there was a planned or outlined mechanism for appointing faculty to this committee (e.g. elections, Dean's recommendation, Academic Senate, etc.). Chair Matson made note that the CPC charge calls for a recommendation from the Chair of the Academic Senate for faculty appointed positions. CPC would probably follow that direction, but it is entirely up to the President.

Dr. Amaral, a member of FACEL, expressed concern in regards to the breakdown in communication. She has done quite a bit of homework over the past ten days and unfortunately could not offer solutions, but agrees with the committee in that communication needs to be improved. However, she is not certain that streamlining is the answer.

Mr. Boyd shared that everything that goes through Campus Planning goes through an extensive process before it comes to the committee for approval. He provided the Jordan Research Center as an example. He further added that there are numerous opportunities for those interested to get involved. First, there are multiple meetings with the parties involved; second, the item comes to CPC for first review; third, based on the input provided the project group goes out to confer with the campus as necessary; and finally, it returns to Campus Planning for approval, and on occasion an additional meeting with this body is required.

Furthermore, the committee meets regularly and the topics covered are important and conducive to the external environment of the campus. This forum provides a great opportunity for those who want to provide input or voice their concern; therefore, there might be a significant benefit in having additional representatives on this committee to help spread the word on new/ongoing projects.

Dr. Constable agreed with Mr. Boyd's comments and looking at the various options, expressed his favor over option 3 because it gets more faculty involved and it puts some of the burden on the colleges. If there is a particular issue or project that is important to a college, then that college needs to make sure that they get involved to support their interest. An additional suggestion is to also add a representative for the Academic Senate as the Academic Senate component is not directly involved in option 3 and there may be some faculty who object to not having a senate representative in a more general sense.

There was additional discussion in regards to an Academic Senate subcommittee that addresses the issues currently covered by CPC subcommittees from an academic standpoint. After much deliberation on this suggestion, Ms. Armstrong offered that CPC expand representation to include a representative from each college and also maintain the two Academic Senate representatives (a combination of options 2 and 3). This would enable school/college representation, provide a general voice for the Academic Senate, and provide faculty opportunities for service as Dr. Williams stated.

Dr. Amaral liked the idea of expanding CPC to broaden representation, but expressed concern over dissolving the Arboretum Subcommittee. Mr. Boyd provided some background on the arboretum by sharing that the effort was initially led, in large part, by Dr. Olney a professor in ornamental horticulture and others who shared his great passion. Subsequently the effort was continued by

Grounds Manager Pete Millier and then Ryan McCaughey who actually completed the paperwork/requirements that earned the university certification as an arboretum.

Mr. Boyd added that the university no longer has a grounds/landscape manager. Those responsibilities have been distributed amongst others. This provides a great opportunity and significant role for faculty that are engaged in this field to be champions, leaders and make our campus that teaching classroom that everybody wants to see. By default, this expectation has fallen back on Facilities Management to try to facilitate. Unfortunately, due to the cutbacks and reductions in staff, it is not realistic and it will not get the attention and passion that a project or goal such as this requires.

Mr. Gaffery clarified the distinction between the Arboretum Subcommittee, a subgroup of CPC, and the Friends of the Arboretum, a separate non-profit organization. Those arboretum functions that the Friends of the Arboretum lead would still continue regardless of the shuttering of the subcommittees. Chair Matson added that Friends of the Arboretum is currently assigned to Professor Bushoven. Dr. Bushoven has access to the funds that have been raised under that group. Also, under Mr. Boyd's leadership, the university has relocated Tree Fresno to campus.

There are many links available on campus and there is no disconnect in terms of wanting the arboretum program to succeed. There just hasn't been enough capacity on the faculty or administrative side to move it forward. The tree walks are still taking place. The university has a landscape architect on board who consults on these types of issues both on Campus Planning and with our architects as new projects develop.

After much discussion, Ms. Astone moved for approval of the recommendation to eliminate the current subcommittees of Campus Planning and expand the structure to include a representative from each school/college and the library, as well as two faculty representatives from the Academic Senate. In addition, the school/college faculty representative may fill one of the positions reserved for the Academic Senate representative at the Senate's discretion. Ms. Armstrong seconded.

* The original motion included placing the subcommittees on hiatus; however, based on Dr. Nef's input, Ms. Astone amended her motion to entirely dissolve the four subcommittees so that faculty who currently serve on those are freed up for opportunities presented by this new structure. The subcommittees can be shuttered, but their form still exists so that after evaluation they can be reinstated if necessary.

Dr. Amaral asked if the recommendation on the table would affect Fresno State's status as an arboretum. Mr. Boyd confirmed that it would not. The arboretum is a campus designation.

Dr. Newell and Mr. Wilson underscored that adding a faculty member from each school/college and the library in addition to the two Academic Senate representatives would add 9 members to this body, bringing the total to 28, requiring 14 members for a quorum.

There was additional discussion and consensus in favor of this approach. Chair Matson called the question. Motion carried without opposition or abstention.

Chair Matson remind everybody, as stated during the last meeting, that CPC is an administrative committee that reports directly to the President, codified in the Board of Trustee's resolution. She will present the recommendation to the President and return to the committee with his decision. If approved by the President, the committee will need to revisit meeting dates and times.

5. Other Business - None

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.